



Speech by

**Mr SANTO SANTORO**

**MEMBER FOR CLAYFIELD**

---

Hansard 14 November 2000

### **WASTE TRANSFER STATION, PINKENBA**

**Mr SANTORO** (Clayfield—LP) (1.30 a.m.): Something has recently happened to infuriate the residents of Pinkenba, a suburb which I have the honour of representing in this Parliament. Local residents were recently notified by the ever hardworking Councillor Tim Nicholls of the Brisbane City Council's approval of an application by a private concern to construct a waste transfer station on Queensland Rail land in Pinkenba.

I need to stress that my constituents who live in Pinkenba are not anti-development and they are not anti-business or industry. They of course appreciate that they live in a very well-defined and in many ways a heavy industrial area next to the Brisbane Airport and the Port of Brisbane. They therefore have been and are very willing to live next to industrial sites and tolerate reasonable nuisances that may emanate from such sites.

In the main, I think it is also fair to say that there is a very, very strong and constructive working relationship between the residents and the businesses of Pinkenba, Eagle Farm and Myrtletown because all appreciate that, without the support of each other, the harmony and the balance which exists in Pinkenba could not be maintained. I was therefore surprised when I recently started receiving correspondence from concerned constituents about the proposal to establish what they consider to be effectively a rubbish dump on railway land adjacent to the old Pinkenba Railway Station on Eagle Farm Road. My constituents are objecting for several reasons, the least not being the total lack of consultation and notification of the proposal to local residents prior to its approval by the Brisbane City Council.

On 1 November 2000 I wrote to the Minister for Local Government and Planning, the Honourable Terry Mackenroth, MP, stating—

"After reviewing the documents that I have forwarded to you, it would seem to me

that sufficient public notification in relation to this issue did not occur and in my view the community is well and truly justified in expressing the views that it has to me and other local representatives."

I then asked the Minister to look into this issue with a view to determining whether all EPA and other local government regulations and laws were complied with when the application to establish a waste transfer station was considered by the council and by the EPA.

I do acknowledge that the Brisbane City Council effectively had no power to reject the application by the private concern because the application had obviously been approved by Queensland Rail, which had agreed to lease its land to the private concern, which is therefore effectively a lease from the State Government.

As honourable members know, a Government enterprise or the State Government itself can basically do whatever it wishes on its land without even having to let local residents and neighbours know about its intentions or indeed its plans. In fact, this is one town planning aspect which I believe needs to be seriously considered for an overhaul. I believe that the public has the right to be notified in a timely fashion of any development plan which Governments may have in relation to their property holdings. At least once upon a time members of Parliament were notified of any property developments which were occurring in their constituency, but unfortunately even this under the new EPA legislation has been discontinued.

I think that I can do no better than quoting directly from a letter that I have received from the Bayside Residents Against Toxic Sites Inc, an organisation of local citizens which seeks to represent the views of the local community when

issues such as the one that we are discussing here tonight arise.

My constituents have listed the following as major reasons for concerns in relation to the proposed waste transfer facility, including: the existing fill on the site shows signs of severe tunnel erosion, which will make effective storm water and leachate control impossible in its current state; the fill observed on the site may be contaminated; the nearest residential address to the site is well within the stated 200 metres from the site's northern boundary; operating hours between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. with 160 vehicle movements with a five-hour peak period between 10 a.m. and 3 p.m. at no more than 15 vehicles per hour—that is 75 vehicle movements—leaving 85 movements in the remaining six hours, which equals 14 vehicles per hour in early morning and late afternoon when traffic flows are at their peak and the most dangerous; Radio Street is located to the west of the Pinkenba residential area, but this does not mean that no vehicles will pass the community as Lomandra Drive provides equally easy access; and visibility of the site is only partially obstructed to residential blocks by the mangroves.

The environmental issues considered in Chapter 4 fail to address leachate control, odour control, vermin control and other health issues. It is unclear how the material will remain on site for only 24 hours. The site is located in close proximity to major hazardous facilities and impacts such as traffic fire risk need to be assessed not as an industrial area. Comment from the Department of Emergency Services should have been sought. The stormwater management plan deals only with the removal of suspended solids, which is clearly inadequate. More detail is needed about types of construction materials and green waste to be treated on site. All sorting and storage areas should be adequately sealed as to minimise smell, dust and vermin that could dramatically affect the existing residential area.

The erosion and sediment control plan is not definitive and current erosion problems have not been addressed. Air and odour controls have been given no consideration in this document. Noise is not considered in the cumulative context. Instead, it relies on background noise to state it will have an insignificant impact. The proposed 200 metre buffer zone to residents is totally inadequate due to the nature of the operation.

My constituents believe that they have not been consulted and they do not have all of the information available to them that they would require to properly assess the application for the construction of a waste transfer facility at Pinkenba. It may in fact come to pass that some of the above-mentioned concerns can be eliminated if only they are consulted in a proper and meaningful fashion and if they are then given the opportunity to work together with the council, the developer and their elected representatives and through them, this State Government, in order to progress this issue to the satisfaction of all.

I urge the Minister to assist me, particularly in my dealings with the EPA, and I look forward to working constructively with State authorities including Queensland Rail in the best interests of my constituents.